

of art" in the system of the world unaided, and therefore powerless for the benefit of mankind;—notwithstanding all these particulars in the state of art, science, and practice, we could not have expected that any doubt should arise that architecture is an art, and kindred with painting and sculpture—nor, further, that she is the most complete impersonation of art, and as such properly comprises all attributes and capabilities of production within herself.

Architecture, something as well as art, is something more than the world calls "architecture." The painter and the sculptor may each produce the highest efforts of design in their limited range, without the slightest knowledge of what produces the beautiful in buildings, whilst the architect is wanting in the education which architecture properly requires, if he be ignorant of painting and sculpture. To produce beauty in architecture, painting and sculpture are almost indispensable, but, although there is no doubt that the combination of the decorative features of buildings, with representations of natural forms enhances the beauty of the latter, we should hardly go to the extent of saying that the necessity for the use of the vehicle of art, in one case, is as great as in the other.

But it is unnecessary to urge further the inseparable relationship of those called *sister-arts*. The association, perhaps less apparent now than it was once, ought never to be interfered with, and the arts of architecture, sculpture, and painting, have, till lately, been deemed equally worthy of encouragement. In all well-constituted academies of art, the great demands of architecture in the system of academic instruction are recognised; we find classes for the study of theoretical architecture and the orders, classes for perspective, classes for ornament, and, even in those which profess to be, like the Royal Academy of London, merely academies of "art," construction itself not neglected. And this is right: the anatomy of buildings has no less concern with the beautiful in architecture, than the anatomy of the human form with the beautiful in painting and sculpture. The French Academy supports an academy at Rome, mainly for its architectural students, who certainly have done honour to their country by talented publications, of which we grieve to say the architects of England, as a body, are wholly ignorant. The Academy of London professes to send one architectural student about once in nine years, but at the last opportunity did not send any. Whatever be the reason for omitting to do so, we charge the omission as indicating one still greater on the part of the academy. In the Academy of St. Luke, at Rome (no art could be forgotten in "the eternal city,"—each class of artists are held to have equal claims to the honours of membership, and the presidency is held by an architect, a painter, and a sculptor, in rotation. In the Academy of London for some years past, whenever an election to the presidency has had to be made, we do not believe the idea has once been entertained of electing an architect, although it cannot be doubted that the architects who have been members of the academy, have been generally well qualified for the post, whether from their eminence as artists, as men learned in art, or as being fitted for the peculiar duties of the president on certain occasions, which duties have often rendered the selection from the class of painters a matter of the utmost difficulty. We believe that the chair of architecture is, and has generally been, filled so as to confer honour upon the Academy, and we might even contrast the attendance at the lectures of Sir John Soane, and at those of the present professor, with the average interest which is excited by the lectures on painting and sculpture.

The Royal Academy, indeed, is not an academy of Art, but a school of painting and society of painters, tolerating a few sculptors and architects in the list of R.A.'s, and at annual dinners, but rigidly excluding them from participation in the advantages which the Academy should confer upon all its members alike, and by preventing the architect and the sculptor having any influence over popular taste in their particular branches, rendering the title of "Royal Academy of Arts" a misnomer. To prove this, it is only requisite to enter the rooms where the works of architects and sculptors find indifferent light and begrudged space; but in the case of architec-

ture there is still more and increasing ground for complaint. The teacher of perspective, the Academy might do its best for its students in choosing from the class of architects, who, judging from the incapacity observable in the works of painters generally, are the only artists who properly understand it. Indeed, so important is the knowledge of perspective to the architect, that we might be justified in expecting to find this important office held by an architect in all cases. In the Royal Academy it is always held by a painter.*

We will say nothing against the Academy, because of the miserably inadequate advantages which it holds out to architectural students; but it is bad indeed to find its attempts to foster a taste for architecture in the public, annually grow less and less. We need not say another word of the room now misnamed "the Architectural," or of the indifference of the architects who are members of the Academy, to the advancement of their art; they, the Institute, and the profession generally, are alike indifferent to what ought to be matter of earnest endeavour to all. We have shewn sufficiently, that we condemn the principle which allows any one of the sister arts to be secondary in importance, or less worthy of attention in an Academy of Arts. We have shewn that we believe architecture to be eminently one of those arts, whose humanizing influence contributes to the attainment of virtue and happiness, and that it is the duty of all who may be placed in the position to develop such influence, by creating and extending a love of it amongst the public, to use the powers which are allowed them. We entertain a strong opinion of the advantages of architectural exhibitions, and whilst we think that the value of the more frequent exhibition of those drawings which can be fully understood merely by professional men, is not properly appreciated by architects, we hold that every opportunity should be taken to familiarize the popular eye with such representations of buildings as can be generally comprehended. For one description of architectural exhibitions, either by promoting more frequent exhibition of competition designs, or by forming collections occasionally, in their own rooms, the Institute might, we think, do something, were it not, as we have said, oppressed with the general apathetic *incubus*. A small architectural society at Manchester, which we fear is now defunct, did much in a few years with the object of improving the system of competitions, and through that means towards advancing the art, by throwing open its rooms for the exhibition of designs sent in competition, which had to be collected at great expense after they had been returned to their owners, and might be imitated by the Institute in aid of the art and the class, which we hold they are specially chartered to foster and protect. But the exhibition of coloured perspective views at the Royal Academy, is calculated to be of the greatest benefit to architecture, as long as it meets with something like the attention which architecture requires in an Academy, or which is given to painting in the Academy of London. This attention it has by no means received; it has become gradually less and less interesting and improving to the public, less advantageous to architects, and is now scarcely valued in any degree by them. Our friend of the *Art-Journal* gives the *coup-de-grace*, the last kick, by coolly saying that architectural drawings "have no business" in the gallery. We think we might just as reasonably say, that being a journalist of art, he has no business to meddle with architecture;—*lucus a non lucendo*; we would rather welcome him as a co-operator in the work, to which we are sure he in his better moments endeavours.

THE NELSON TESTIMONIAL.—Another of the alto-relievos intended to adorn the pedestal of the Nelson column, is completed, and on the eve of casting. The subject is illustrative of the battle of Copenhagen, in which Mr. Ternouth, the artist, has seized a well-known incident (sealing the dispatch) which strongly marked the coolness and forethought which prevailed on all occasions in the mind of our great naval hero.

* We would not have our remark apply disparagingly in any way to the present professor, Mr. Knight, who, we believe, performs his duty most efficiently. We are dealing with the broad principle.

THE THEATRES AND PORTICOES OF ANCIENT ROME.

BY THE REV. R. BURGESS, B.D.*

IN looking among my antiquarian and literary stores to prepare a subject for the Institute, I again found that it was not necessary for me to go out of old Rome, for although in a series of papers spread over some twelve years, I have led you "O'er steps of broken thrones and temples," and placed you in forums, baths, or halls, I have never yet described to you the theatres and porticoes which formed so important a feature in the architectural beauties of Rome.

The amphitheatre was an edifice unknown to the Greeks, the theatre was hardly ever naturalized among the Romans, and with the exception of some tragedies, ascribed to Seneca, which are lost, it does not appear that a single Roman tragedy was ever composed upon a Roman subject. Porticoes which were generally in the vicinity of theatres and circuses at Rome, are the natural growth of a climate subject to great heat and sudden rains: we lose in these northern regions that great ornament of a city the portico. Our admiration is limited to arcades and covered markets, which it must be confessed are more for use than ornament. But I return to the theatre. The ancient and modern drama differ as widely as the buildings in which they were respectively acted, and I shall hardly succeed in making my Roman theatre intelligible, unless I first indicate a few of the leading features which run through the Greek drama and its Roman descendant. The subject is by far too vast and intricate for me to attempt anything like an essay upon the Greek stage, and therefore I must limit my observations to what is strictly necessary for explaining the internal arrangements of the edifice. The Greek drama dealt more in set speeches than in broken dialogues, and did not admit more than three interlocutors at once: the action or event represented was brought within the space of time, in which it might in reality have been accomplished. As a general rule there was no change of scene during the piece. In every tragedy there was a body called a chorus, who took no part in the action of the piece, but reflected upon what was going on, and generally expressed what might be supposed to be the sense of the audience. The chorus did not come upon the stage, but occupied the orchestra, varying the dialogue which they sometimes held with the actors by choral songs and dancing. These terms of *stage* and *orchestra* I shall have shortly to explain.

Dramatic entertainments, both in Greece and Rome, formed part of the public expenditure, or they were exhibited gratuitously by some wealthy or ambitious citizen. The theatres, therefore, were of immense size, for they were meant to contain (in Greece, at least) the whole male population of great cities. The performance usually took place also in an uncovered theatre in Greece, but Roman luxury, at a later period, invented the awning. I once described to you, when I read a paper on the Colosseum, how this awning was contrived to cover such an immense space; and I must be allowed to suppose that you have not entirely forgotten that description. If any of you are desirous of satisfying your curiosity upon the Greek stage, I must refer you to Butenges de Theatre, for I now hasten to the buildings themselves, which it is the principal object of this paper to describe. The origin of the theatre is rather ignoble;—it was originally a waggon, in which Thespis conveyed his actors about, with their faces besmeared with lees of wine, and from which they spoke their parts to the crowd assembled around them. To the ambulatory waggon of Thespis succeeded a moveable wooden structure, which was set up and taken down at pleasure, and it was in consequence of one of these structures having given way under an unusual crowd, that the first stone theatre was erected in Greece, by Themistocles, not long after the defeat of Xerxes. From this they began to increase in number, and we have the remains of several yet existing, both in Greece and in that part of Italy which was Greek in language and customs long after it came under the Roman dominion. We have also those

* Read at a meeting of the Royal Institute of Architects, already noticed.